1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	Plaintiff, Case No. 11-20129-8
5	VINCENT WITORT, D-8,
6 7	Defendant/
8	MOTION HEARING
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT H. CLELAND United States District Judge Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard Detroit, Michigan July 9, 2014
.2	APPEARANCES:
3 4 5 6	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: ERIC STRAUS U.S. Attorney's Office 211 W. Fort Street Suite 2001 Detroit, MI 48226
.7	FOR THE DEFENDANT: KIMBERLY W. STOUT Kimberly W. Stout, PC 370 East Maple Road Floor 3 Birmingham, MI 48009
9 20 21	ALSO PRESENT: BYRON H. PITTS PHILLIP COMORSKI
22 23 24	To Obtain a Certified Transcript Contact: Christin E. Russell, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CSR - (248) 420-2720 Proceedings produced by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided Transcription.
> 5	

1	TARLE OF COMPENIES	
2	TABLE OF CONTENTS Hearing Page	
3	<pre>Hearing Motion Hearing 5</pre>	
4	Fiotion nearing	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	Exhibits: (None Offered.)	
10	(0.00.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	
11		
12	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 25	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
Detroit, Michigan
 2
     July 9, 2014
 3
     2:41 p.m.
 4
 5
             (Conference in chambers; Defendant not present.)
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Mr. Straus, good afternoon. Who else do
 8
    we have here? Ms. Stout.
 9
                          Judge, Kim Stout.
              MS. STOUT:
10
              THE COURT: Good morning.
11
              MS. STOUT: This is Mr. Byron Pitts.
12
              THE COURT: Yes.
13
              MS. STOUT: And his co-counsel, Phillip Comorski.
14
              And this, as you know, is Michael Naughton who is our
15
    technical expert.
                        The reason I brought him is if you had
    questions, he actually attended a couple visits of my client
16
17
    with me. So he is available to answer any -- I just didn't
18
    know what to expect, your Honor, including the fact that he
19
    helped him with the iPad, transferred information, as well as
20
    my offer to withdraw in front of Mr. Naughton, which the client
    didn't want me to do.
21
22
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, the reason that we were in
23
    court at all, though the record should reflect that we are in a
24
    conference room off the courtroom here, out of the presence of
     the defendant, purely at the request of counsel, collectively,
```

I understood, I certainly want to proceed on the record here.

I'm a little bit uncertain, at least about proceeding in the absence of the defendant who is waiting I think in custody in the courtroom. I was simply told that counsel wanted to briefly meet with me before we, before we proceeded in court on the record.

And the reason that we are here at all is because of this proposed stipulation of substitution of counsel, more or less on the eve of trial, after two years of preparation, which is an extraordinary thing to request. And I wanted to hear the details of that before I approved it, being satisfied as I am Ms. Stout's performance thus far.

MS. STOUT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: So is there some preliminary matter that we need to discuss?

MR. PITTS: Just a, a caveat to going forward. I just wanted to let -- for the record, Byron Pitts.

I understand the lateness of our request to come into the case and the potential issues it might bring up if we were allowed in or not allowed in.

In speaking with Ms. Stout, I just wanted to let the Court know that if, we would have no problem working with Ms. Stout, if the Court saw fit to allow us in the case and saw fit to keep her in the case. We have been -- that's all I wanted to say. I'm not sure if that's even on the radar of the Court.

```
But I wanted to let the Court know that is something that
 2
     amongst ourselves, we would not have a problem with, ultimately
 3
    understanding that the final decision is yours. But that's
    all. That's it.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. Well, of course that is a matter to
 6
    be -- that could be I think as easily repeated and probably
 7
    should be repeated --
 8
             MS. STOUT: Okay.
 9
             THE COURT: -- in the presence of defendant.
10
    wouldn't come as a surprise to him, in any event, I would
11
    imagine.
12
              I think we should just assemble in court and we will
13
    have a discussion of the predicates of this, of this request
14
    and the advantages and disadvantages. And I'll see what I make
    of it.
15
16
              I'm entirely uncertain fundamentally as I indicated
17
    earlier, because of the lateness of the hour. But let's
18
     reassemble in court, and we'll just terminate this record for
19
    the moment. And I'll have everybody have a chance to make a
20
     statement, as appropriate, when we reassemble in court.
21
              Thank you.
22
              (Conference in chambers concluded, 2:45 p.m.)
23
              (Call to Order of the Court; all parties present.)
24
25
              THE CLERK: Calling case No. 11-20129. The United
```

States of America vs. Vincent John Witort. Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.

MR. STRAUS: Good afternoon, your Honor. On behalf of the United States, Eric Straus, Assistant United States
Attorney.

MS. STOUT: Good afternoon. Kimberly Stout on behalf of Vincent Witort, who is seated to my left.

THE COURT: The matter is -- good afternoon. The matter is before the Court because of the Court's receipt of the stipulation for substitution of counsel that was presented to me some time ago.

The proposal is that Ms. Stout, "shall be relieved from any further responsibility in the above-entitled matter" and that "Byron H. Pitts and Phillip Comorski shall substitute as retained counsels in place of Kimberly Stout." And Mr. Pitts is here, as well as Mr. Comorski. And I recognize their presence here as well.

The defendant is personally present. And at the request of counsel, I think Mr. Pitts, we conferred briefly in chambers, although on the record and out of the hearing of the defendant, at which time Mr. Pitts said the only reason that a conference was requested in advance of this hearing was to indicate that, I think the way you put it, Mr. Pitts, was that you would have no problem in working with Ms. Stout if you were permitted to be co-counsel, or something similar to that. Am I

```
correct about that?
 2
             MR. PITTS: Essentially, yes, your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 4
             Ms. Stout has been representing the defendant since
     what time, Ms. Stout? The commencement of the indictment?
 5
 6
              MS. STOUT: July 2012 I was appointed, your Honor.
 7
     The first visit with my client was the 1st of August in the
 8
     Wayne County Jail, of 2012.
 9
             THE COURT: About a year.
10
             MS. STOUT: That's two years.
11
             THE COURT: I'm sorry. How time flies. Two years.
12
             And the volume of material that you've reviewed over
13
    that, over that time, amounts to approximately what?
             MS. STOUT: Your Honor, I reviewed my records before
14
15
    this hearing and made a few notes. I have had approximately,
    and I don't want to be stuck to the exact number, 19 visits at
16
    various jails with Mr. Witort, many of which were at Midland
17
18
    County Jail where he is housed with his iPad. One was at
19
    Dickerson, where he was temporarily housed, and several were at
20
    Wayne County Jail where was first incarcerated.
21
             Two of those meetings were attended by Mr. Michael
22
    Naughton, who is here today. He has been court-appointed
23
    technical assistant. He attended two -- one very recent
24
    meeting to make sure the transfer of all my client's notes and
     comments to me on the iPad were properly placed on my computer
```

so that I had everything and wouldn't miss anything; I didn't trust myself enough to do it myself. And the first time was back in February of this year, where Mr. Naughton wanted to make sure my client was clear on what he was doing and taught him some new techniques with the iPad so he could review the materials better. So that is why I brought him.

And just so the Court knows that at that meeting back in February, which was seven months ago, the issue of whether, because of Mister -- well, I want to be very careful with the attorney/client privilege, your Honor. I'm not sure that there's any real waiver. I'm just going to say that there was some discussions about, you know, him wanting me to stay, if he wanted me to withdraw.

As far as my review, I reviewed pretty much all of the 25-plus thousand pages that were initially provided. There is a search technique, so I did not go through them one-by-one.

I have searched and searched and I believe reviewed everything that's pertinent. Obviously in a RICO, you can't say that nothing isn't, but I think the Court understands.

Further, we got a new CD with 7,200 pages that I picked up last week and have already perused and found what I felt to be most important to my client.

As far as the Jencks, which we have not received yet, which I understand to be 3,500 pages, your Honor, I have had

three meetings with the U.S. Attorney, Mr. Straus and Ms.

Mohsin. And I'm not sure if the agent -- yes, and the agent
was attendant at some of those, Agent Flemings, because I was
provided courtesy of reviewing the Jencks as early as a year
ago. Part of the reason was a request by me, the Government's
willingness to be open and understanding that names wouldn't be
revealed and they were redacted, that sort of thing. And also,
so that we could logically and reasonably discuss plea, if
there's any possibility of a plea negotiation. So those
meetings included plea negotiation conversations, as well as my
review of Jencks. So I really have a handle on this case, to
say the least.

I've also brought with me, because I know my client is a little concerned about communication, this is one of two files of correspondence and e-mails between my client, his brother, Paul Witort, who you had met, your Honor, because he testified at the bond hearing, the older gentleman, my constant communication through what my client told me was the liaison, who was Paul Witort.

Obviously, nothing about the details of discovery were discussed, your Honor, because it's protected, but just procedure, parameters, in case my client -- because my client talked to him regularly. And some of that, of course, is e-mail between counsel and the Government, not just the client. But there's two of those, and there's a lot of it.

```
1
              So I've also learned the systems, you know, that Emma
 2
    has provided us. I'm having a little trouble with Case Manage.
 3
    And I'm going to have another instruction on that, if need be.
     Though, I may not be.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          That's a program that you're talking?
 6
                          That's a program that helps us, she has
             MS. STOUT:
 7
     all -- she will have all 35,000 pages on that. Right now,
 8
    there should be the 25 plus the 72. Even though the 25 and 72
 9
    are already searchable, on Case Manage, it's even a more
10
    powerful way to search because it itemizes things, warrants,
11
     you know, lab reports, that way, making it a lot easier.
12
     again, I hope I'm not waiving -- I don't want to waive anything
13
    that -- I don't think that's anything to be concerned about.
14
              THE COURT:
                         No.
15
                          Okay. So in terms of my preparation, your
             MS. STOUT:
16
    Honor, I have invested a lot in this case. And as you know --
17
             THE COURT: About roughly how many hours? Have you
18
    totalled that up?
19
             MS. STOUT: I didn't total the hour. I've kept -- I
20
     just recently went over my budget. My budget was $35,000, your
21
    Honor, that I proposed to this Court. I know I spoke with Mr.
22
    Rants at great length when I developed that budget. I know
    some attorneys are right around there, and some attorneys are
23
24
    more. I don't know their details.
25
              I have stuck within that budget that was meant for a
```

year for nearly two years. Now, I am over it. But part of the reason is because trial is at our heels. And I have set out a lot of time to get ready for this case, your Honor. So that's why I had the time to go over these CDs recently and, you know, that was part of my plan in my mind. That's how -- you know, I'm a private practice. It's just me. So I turned away some business in order to clear this, to be ready and available for this.

I also discussed an issue you had brought up at one of the pretrial about having buddies or joint defense agreements didn't go over too well, but having buddies, if you're going to be late, that sort of thing. And I talked about that with Jerry Sabbota and me, and Patty Maceroni kind of, you know, watching out for each other, that sort of thing.

So finally, your Honor, I got so far as to prepare my closing argument, because I learned from Mr. Fink early on, back 29 years ago that, you know, if you want to understand, you have to understand the case to start developing your closing argument so you know where you've got to get to if you want to be able to argue that. So am I prepared? Yes, your Honor, I am very prepared.

THE COURT: There's, there's no indication of any conflict that's come to my attention.

MS. STOUT: There -- conflict of interest? Or conflict with my client?

THE COURT: The kind of conflict that sometimes arises -- no, not conflict of interest. A conflict between counsel and client, so-called irreconcilable differences, the kind of language that we used to hear before the era of no-fault divorces. Irreconcilable differences that have lead to a complete breakdown of communication, such that counsel cannot effectively represent the client and things of that sort. No hint of that throughout any of these proceedings with respect to you and Mr. Witort, that I'm aware of.

Is there -- have I missed something in that regard?

MS. STOUT: To be completely honest with you, your

Honor, you know, my client and I have had some difficulties,

which is part of the reason Mr. Naughton is here. And again,

you know, he's upset. Obviously, he's been incarcerated for

two years and misses his family, and so we've had a few words.

And he doesn't always think that my strategy, which I've shared

with him is, is maybe the same strategy he wants to use, for

instance, in certain stipulations and things like that. I

would not say that it's insurmountable by any means.

Like I said, I did offer at one point to, not at one point, several points to withdraw, only because he seemed upset. But as a CJA counsel, and having done this for so long, I generally get along very well with my clients. But there is occasions where it's a little bit stressed, and that's part of my job, I feel, and I've done my best. So I did not believe

```
that and was quite surprised to learn of -- I got call from Mr. Pitts out of the blue, quite frankly. So I know Mr. Pitts is an incredibly competent lawyer. I have respect for him, but I did not know.
```

THE COURT: Mr. Pitts, is there anything you want to add to the record?

MR. PITTS: Your Honor, I think with the Court's permission, we'd like to have the opportunity to possible reply to the Government's objection to us getting in the case, if we could respond at that time?

THE COURT: I'm not sure that they've objected exactly. The Government has suggested to me the standards, and I think those standards are fairly well recognized. Especially in cases where there's an allegation of a conflict, irreconcilable, or nearly so.

The timeliness of the motion to substitute attorneys is significant. The extent of the conflict, the nature of the conflict, the nature of the lack of communication, if there's any suggested -- none has been suggested thus far to me. But the public has an interest in the prompt and efficient administration of justice. And I think that there should be a presumption in favor of maintaining the status quo, unless there's a reason to deviate from it. I think we should not be, as a general matter, jumping around from attorney to attorney in the process of the case, in any case needlessly.

```
1
              A fair amount of public funds have been expended in
 2
    providing representation in preparation for Mr. Witort over the
    past couple of years, beyond $40,000 at this point.
 3
 4
              One question that arises in my mind is whether, in the
 5
    prospect of retaining counsel, he apparently has found
 6
    resources beyond the $500 a month Social Security benefit that
 7
    he claimed under oath in applying for publicly-funded counsel
 8
    originally. So apparently he has located other funds to hire
 9
     counsel now, to retain substitute counsel. And I wonder aloud
10
     in that regard whether he is prepared to reimburse the Court
11
     for the roughly $40,000 of funds that have already been
12
     expended in providing a defense for him.
13
              What do you think about that, Mr. Pitts?
              MR. COMORSKI: Your Honor, Phillip Comorski.
14
15
              THE COURT: Are you proposed first chair then, Mr.
16
     Comorski?
17
              MR. COMORSKI:
                             No.
                                  I was just going to respond to the
18
     Court's concerns about public funds being reimbursed.
19
              I just want the Court to be aware that third parties
20
    on behalf of Mr. Witort reached out to us and hired us,
21
    potentially sought to hire us. It was not Mr. Witort on his
22
    own.
23
              THE COURT: So did that third party propose that the
24
    public funds that have been expended be reimbursed in
25
     satisfaction of Ms. Stout's performance thus far?
```

```
MR. COMORSKI:
 1
                             No.
 2
             THE COURT: So that's not a first step that was
 3
     suggested?
 4
             MR. COMORSKI:
 5
             THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Pitts, do you think you can
 6
    prepare a defense and do, in the course of perhaps 60 days,
 7
    what Ms. Stout has taken two years to accomplish?
 8
             MR. PITTS: May it please the Court, your Honor.
 9
    Certainly, we believe we can. There will be two of us working
10
    on the case, if Mr. Comorski and I are allowed in.
11
     familiar with the volume. Obviously because there's a
12
    protective order, we don't know the details of what's in the
13
    discovery material, but we are aware of the volume and we're
14
    prepared to go forward.
15
              THE COURT: Are you aware of any suggestion of
16
    conflict between present counsel that rises to a recognizable
    level, Mr. Pitts?
17
18
             MR. PITTS: Your Honor, in light of the fact that,
19
    without getting into conversations I've had with Mr. Witort, I
20
    have been made aware that he is now casting no aspersions on
21
    Ms. Stout. I know she's an excellent attorney, but he is
22
    unhappy with some of the things that have been done by present
23
    counsel. So I'm not sure if that rises -- I know that's an
24
    issue with him and her.
25
              I am not really in a position to intelligently
```

analyze, you know, whether or not -- because I wasn't there, I wasn't in court, and I've just gotten here, whether or not everything is -- I'm not **intelligently** analyze the issues, the strengths and merits of the complaints, but I know he's unhappy about what's gone on.

He's indicated through other members of his circle, not him, he's indicated he would like to retain somebody else. Other members of his circle, friends and family have gathered the funds for us. So whether or not that rises to a level of conflict sufficient for the Court, I am not -- I don't know.

THE COURT: What, to the both of you, I ask what role does the Court play and what obligation does a proposed substitute counsel have to reveal enough to the judicial tribunal to ensure that the source of funds for the representation, not being the defendant's own funds, do not in and of themselves indicate a conflict of interest or other similar ethical problem? What obligation do counsel have and what obligation does the Court have? What do we know about that?

Mr. Comorski?

MR. COMORSKI: I guess I don't understand the question, your Honor. Are you asking --

THE COURT: How is it that the Court can be assured, let me put it more bluntly, that the funds are derived from someone who has an interest adverse to that of Mr. Witort?

```
1
             MR. COMORSKI: Oh, I see. I suppose we could get
 2
     affidavits from the persons involved and submit them to the
 3
     Court for the Court's review. That would be one option, of
 4
    course.
 5
              THE COURT: Perhaps. What does the law say about any
 6
    obligation that counsel may have or that the Court may have to
 7
     look into such matters?
 8
             MR. COMORSKI: I'm not aware of any such law, your
 9
    Honor.
10
             THE COURT: How many federal capital-level offense
11
    defenses have you participated in, Mr. Comorski?
12
             MR. COMORSKI: Myself? None. I've done appellate
13
    work.
14
              THE COURT: And Mr. Pitts, what about you?
15
             MR. PITTS: If I can, I'm counting. I'd say about
16
     three, your Honor. I did a federal death penalty case in front
17
    of Judge Victoria Roberts. I'm presently involved in a similar
18
     case, a RICO-related motorcycle club case in front of Judge
19
    Borman presently.
20
             THE COURT: When is that going to trial?
21
             MR. PITTS: January 24th.
22
                         And you have nothing on your schedule
             THE COURT:
23
    between now and then?
24
             MR. PITTS: I have a trial in Wayne County Circuit
             I do have things on my schedule, your Honor, but I'm
```

```
prepared -- I don't have any trials set other than a trial set
 2
     in July.
 3
              THE COURT: This is July.
 4
             MR. PITTS: Understood. I have another trial in Wayne
 5
     County Circuit Court set two weeks from now, capital case. I
 6
    have a -- no, strike that. It's not a capital case.
 7
              I have two trials in this building which are set for
 8
    trial, which I do not think are going to go. A case in front
 9
    of Judge Drain, a narcotic case, I don't think it's going to --
10
     I don't think my client is going to go to trial on that.
11
    another case, which has not -- in front of -- no. I don't have
12
    any other trials set, other than the one in front of Judge
13
    Drain, which I do not believe is going to go forward, and a
14
    capital case in Wayne County Circuit Court set in a couple of
15
    weeks. Strike that. If I said "capital" it's not capital
16
     case.
17
             THE COURT:
                          Okay. By capital in Michigan, what we
18
    mean is life imprisonment max.
19
             MR. PITTS: Understood, your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you. At least that's
21
    what I --
22
             MR. PITTS: I represented this individual on a capital
23
    case, and this is something else.
24
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you.
             Mr. Straus, for the Government, you filed a brief to
25
```

assist the Court. Does the Government actually have a position in this regard?

MR. STRAUS: Obviously, after hearing Ms. Stout, there's obviously far more here in terms of what she has done on behalf of Mr. Witort than, you know, the prosecution can imagine. I know that Ms. Stout has met with us several times.

It just strikes the Government that it would almost be impossible to replicate what she has done thus far to get Mr. Pitts and his co-counsel to where Ms. Stout is here today. I find it inconceivable that he could be ready in, in two months. And I think under the case law, in the interest of efficiency, the Court should certainly deny that request for substitution of counsel.

I also note, to put on the Court's radar and mentioned it, the authority for seeking reimbursement is 18 USC, Section 3006A. That is the Criminal Justice Act of 1964, subpart (F). And it does not differentiate between the defendant's own funds or funds "on behalf of a person who is furnished representation."

If the Court were to require deposit in the Treasury of that 40 some thousand dollars, I'm assuming that whatever the source, and it's -- whatever the source is, it's not an inexhaustible funding source. I can well imagine at some point in time prior to trial a realization that that source has dried up and we would be back here asking for either new counsel, or

for the appointment of Mr. Pitts and his co-counsel to be CJA attorneys, and so, or worse yet, new counsel. So I don't know how -- I just put that on the Court's radar, all of which I think raises some issues, some substantial issues.

And I think also, I think the Court is right. I think there should be some inquiry as to the source of these funds. There is, after all, a forfeiture provision in this particular matter. It hasn't come up on in the Court's radar because most of the defendants have filed affidavits of indigency, and so there's been no need to conduct, it's not a Nebbia hearing, but it's a hearing akin to that, to determine the source of the funds for the attorney representation, to ensure that they are not illegal funds. So those are the court — the Government's observations, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Straus.

With that, I'm going to ask for a -- I'm going to allow an opportunity, as Mr. Pitts suggested earlier, for him to file a response commensurate with the length of the Government's filing here, which is not specifically in opposition, but now I think with the additional information provided, I interpret as being essentially in opposition to changing horses here in midstream at this time, so close to trial, after the amount of work that Ms. Stout has done.

So if the object of the proposed stipulated substitution is still sought, if the goal is still sought, that

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is to substitute counsel, then I would direct proposed substitute counsel to file a paper, presumably under seal, explaining the situation, laying out as specifically as may be deemed appropriate the funding source information, allaying any concern that any observer might have to the possibility of Explaining the sufficiency of the funding going forward to allay the concern that Mr. Straus has mentioned here, that is, the source of funds becoming exhausted mid-trial and giving rise to the need for additional Criminal Justice Act funding to support a legal defense on to the conclusion of the matter. And explaining in more detail than has been done thus far about how in the world an attorney, or even a pair of attorneys could, given the time constraints of other pending business and other pending trials, replicate the work that has been done by one attorney in the course of 24 months in a mere 60 days, and still provide adequate representation, sufficient to meet a Strickland standard, if challenged upon trial and conviction, if that were to be the case.

I'm concerned, in other words, as a fundamental matter underlying all of this, that to allow substitute counsel in at this point, no matter how well experienced he or she may be, and to essentially force the continuation of trial with the massive amount of work that is necessary for preparation would be to set up, first, well, first of all, to set up the defendant for failure, so to speak, because of inadequate time

```
for preparation. Or if not that, to set up a 2255 petition post-conviction with, with at least the allegation, if not the reality of ineffective assistance due to insufficient time for preparation. There is, there is an absolutely inherent and I think unavoidable problem in that regard, probably unavoidable. But I remain to be perhaps persuaded.
```

If you'll file that by Friday, I'll look at it, Mr. Pitts. And thank you. I have nothing further.

Ms. Stout, you have something further. Ms. Stout?

Ms. STOUT: I'm sorry, your Honor, just two quick

things. I'm very hesitant in what my role should be at this

point in terms of work, because things keep coming in and

e-mails keep crossing my computer. And there's 7,200 pages

there. And there's things I think my client should have.

THE COURT: I think that you should, you should continue to perform, having not been relieved of any responsibilities at this point. You are counsel of record, and so you remain unless and until I order otherwise.

MS. STOUT: Okay. And one last thing, your Honor.

Thank you for that clarification. One last thing is I know that, and I'll just say it again here, because it's come up so many times with respect to Mr. Witort, is his concern for a speedy trial. And I believe that one of his, his, his concerns I believe I, I did sign the first stipulation, and after that, I believe I filed a notice for speedy trial. And as your Honor

knows, I filed a bond motion with an alternative for dismissal because of speedy trial issues. I know that there is some, I don't know if that is a conflict between us about that very initial adjournment or not, but I just thought I should bring that to the Court's attention, because he has specifically mentioned --

THE COURT: Well, for the benefit of your client, I can assure you that the adjournment would have been granted with or without his consent, because of the complexity of the trial. This case has been designated by judicial determination as an exceedingly complex case.

It's, it's obvious that the lengths we've gone to provide this information, for example, to defendants, including this one, is almost unheard of. It's exceedingly rare, let's just put it that way, exceedingly rare. The number of defendants, the number of defense attorneys, the staffing support that has been required, the attorneys they've had to bring in, one of whom his name escapes me now. Mister?

MR. NAUGHTON: Naughton, your Honor.

THE COURT: Naughton, who has been brought in not as an attorney but as a technical advisor, at the request of multiple number of attorneys who are not as adept as others may be with respect to operating an iPad, or searching files, optimizing PDFs and things of that sort. The complexities of this case have been remarkable.

```
1
              This case would have been continued with or without
 2
     your stipulation, Ms. Stout, or your client's agreement.
 3
    had disagreed and vehemently objected and said to the contrary
 4
    at the initial opportunity to agree with a substitution -- with
 5
    a continuation, it would have been continued. Of course you
 6
                 I'm stating this for his benefit here, because here
    know that.
 7
    he is listening.
 8
              All right. Anything else, Ms. Stout?
 9
              MS. STOUT:
                         No.
10
              THE COURT:
                          I intend to have this matter decided
11
     rapidly, so that you'll have -- you'll know whether you are
12
     either continuing or not continuing. And I'll take Mr. Pitts'
13
     comments by Friday noon, please. All right?
14
              MS. STOUT:
                          Thank you, your Honor.
15
              THE COURT:
                          That's all. Thank you.
16
              MR. PITTS: What was the last thing you said? You'll
17
     take my comments by?
18
              THE COURT:
                          Friday noon.
19
                          By Friday at noon.
              MR. PITTS:
                         Noon time.
20
              THE COURT:
21
              MR. PITTS:
                          Okay.
22
              THE COURT: As opposed to midnight.
23
              MR. PITTS:
                          Thank you.
24
              THE CLERK: All rise. Court is now in recess.
25
              (Proceedings adjourned at 3:15 p.m.)
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER As an official court reporter for the United States District Court, appointed pursuant to provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth. s/ Christin E. Russell CHRISTIN E. RUSSELL, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CSR Federal Official Court Reporter